

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

FILED BY *lg* D.C.
05 OCT 24 PM 5:05

PHILLIP LACEFIELD,
Plaintiff,

vs.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, et al.,
Defendants.

X
X
X
X
X
X
X
X
X
X

No. 05-2233-B/P

THOMAS M. GOULD
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
W/D OF TENN. MEMPHIS

ORDER MOTION TO SCREEN COMPLAINT AS MOOT

On October 4, 2005, the Court entered an order dismissing this complaint. On October 6, 2005, plaintiff filed an irregular motion requesting that the Court screen his complaint.¹ The Court screened plaintiff's complaint prior to entering the order of dismissal on October 4, 2005. Accordingly, the motion to screen the complaint is DENIED as moot.²

IT IS SO ORDERED this 24th day of October, 2005.


J. DANIEL BREEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Because plaintiff referenced Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), the Clerk docketed the motion as a motion for reconsideration. The motion contains no basis for reconsideration of the order of dismissal and is clearly a simple request that the Court screen the complaint. Plaintiff had not had sufficient time to receive a copy of the screening order when he mailed this request.

² The Clerk shall note that this order disposes of the irregular motion docketed as a motion for reconsideration (docket entry # 15).



Notice of Distribution

This notice confirms a copy of the document docketed as number 20 in case 2:05-CV-02233 was distributed by fax, mail, or direct printing on October 25, 2005 to the parties listed.

Phillip Lacefield
FCC-FORREST CITY
18183-076
P.O. Box 3000
Forrest City, AR 72336--300

Honorable J. Breen
US DISTRICT COURT